In the final office action mailed on June 6, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 37-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner also rejected claims 21-24, 33 and 46 as being anticipated by Tummala et al. (US Patent No. 6,915,345) and claims 25-32 and 34-45 as being unpatentable over Tummala in view of Lynch (US Patent No. 6,487,600).

Claims 1, 37, 38 and 46 have been amended. New claim 47 has been added. Claims 21-47 are now pending in this application. The foregoing amendments and the following remarks are considered by applicant to overcome each of the Examiner's outstanding rejections. An early Notice of Allowance is therefore requested.

The Examiner's rejection of claims 37-38 were due to the lack of antecedent basis for various claim language. Amended claims 37 and 38 correct these informalities.

The Examiner rejected claims 21-24, 33 and 46 as being anticipated by Tummala. In particular, the Examiner stated that Tummala discloses the claim recitation that the client system does not access any resources of the host system outside of the tunnel in Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 14-58, col. 7, line 41- col. 9, line 65, col. 11, line 40 – col. 12, line 36. It is unclear to the applicant how Tummala teaches this claim recitation.

While Tummala uses the word "tunnel," the tunnel that Tummala is describing is the process of transferring information packets from the home agent to the foreign agent. See col. 5, lines 13-16. This tunneling includes routing through the public network of the Internet, which is different from the tunnel created through the host system and under the control of the host system.

In addition, Tummala continually uses the word "secure" to describe the connection, but it is unclear exactly what security is being described. In the cited sections of the specification identified by the Examiner, any security concerns described by Tummala appear to be different than the one that the claimed invention is addressing.

There are five paragraphs in col. 6, lines 14-58. The first paragraph generically describes the use of broker servers to avoid overhead. The second paragraph describes the use of SLAs to make arrangement between networks. The third paragraph

describes how these arrangements becomes a consortium of agreements. The fourth paragraph describes how a mobile node can roam throughout these networks. The fifth paragraph does not describe any security concerns. Thus, the first cited section by the Examiner does not describe the relevant security concerns.

In the second portion cited by the Examiner (col. 7, line 41- col. 9, line 65), Tummala describes the procedure of sending the information from the home network to the mobile network, but does not describe protecting the resources of the home network by limiting access to the tunnel. The first section of the second cited portion is titled "'Tunneling' of Information Packets" and it describes the general layout of the home and foreign networks and how the Mobile Node would leave a care-of address of the foreign network with the Home Agent so that information packets sent to the home network can be forwarded to the Mobile Node at the foreign Network. It does not describe any limitations of the tunnel.

The second section of the second cited portion is entitled "Registration of Mobile Nodes" and describes the process of registering the mobile nodes with the foreign agent so that it is recognized as a viable route to connect to the mobile node. This section does speak of a secure connection (lines 45-46), but it is believed that that secure connection refers to the connection back to the home Agent.

The third section of the second cited portion is entitled "Service Level Agreements (SLAs)" and it describes the procedures for connection between networks. While this section uses the word "secure" throughout this section, the type of security being referred to is the security as exists between these networks, not within a network.

The third cited portion that the Examiner cites to is entitled "Broker Redirection" and it is understood to refer to the process of redirecting the route by which the information packets will reach the intended home network. Again, this section does not describe the type of security claims by amended claim 21 and amended claim 46.

In particular, amended claim 21 and amended claim 46 recite that the tunnel is under the control of the host system and that the client system cannot access any resources of the host system outside of the tunnel. This effective reassures the host system that it will not suffer any security concerns by agreeing to be a member of this cooperative networking system. Indeed, the

host system of the present invention is given more authority than appears to be described in Tummala.

For example, upon a request by a mobile node to access the Internet, Tummala appears to describe a system wherein the foreign agent must first access the Internet to access the Broker AAA server in order to determine if connection to the mobile node is warranted. See col. 8, lines 35-52. Only after verifying it with the AAA server will the foreign Agent allow the Mobile Node to connect to it. In contrast, amended claim 21 and 46 specifies that such connection can occur with an authorization process that occurs locally before accessing the Internet.

In addition, Tummala describes a connection system wherein if the Mobile Node is not associated with a home network that has a relationship (either direct SLA or SLA with broker service) with that foreign Agent, then there will be no connection. The present invention allows for the host node to make an authorization decision such as a one-off exception and allow a connection despite the prerequisite membership. Amended claim 21 and 46 have been amended to recite that ability as well. Thus, for the foregoing reasons, the applicant believe that Tummala does not teach amended claims 21 and 46.

Claims 22-45 all depend from claim 21 and should be allowable for the same reasons that claim 21 is allowable.

Applicants have added new claim 47 to further clarify the invention. Similar to claims 21 and 46, claim 47 also recites that the connection between the mobile unit and the host mode can occur through a local authorization process. Thus, it is believed that new claim 47 is allowable over the prior art as well.

Claims 21-47, the only claims pending in this application, are believed by applicants to define patentable subject matter and should be passed to issue at the earliest possible time. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and favorable

reconsideration and prompt notice to that affect are
earnestly solicited.

                              Respectfully submitted,

December 5, 2006
                        By: _____
                              Stephen M. Chin, Reg. No. 39,938
                              Reed Smith LLP
                              599 Lexington Avenue
                              New York, NY 10022-765
                              (212) 521-5400